REMARKS

The foregoing amendments are in addition to the amendments filed July 3, 2006.

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks filed July 3, 2006, as well as the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 14, as a result of which claim 14 has been cancelled, without prejudice. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to state that the deep rolling is performed with an applied load between 800 daN and 1200 daN, thus generating high residual compressive stresses. Support for these amendments is found on page 1, lines 18-29, page 5, lines 12-13, and page 12, lines 21-25. Therefore, no new matter has been added to the application.

In the Advisory Action dated July 19, 2006, the Examiner stated that the newly recited term "deep rolling" presents an issue of new matter since there is no descriptive support in the original specification.

Applicants previously asserted, in the Amendment filed July 3, 2006, that the prior used term "burnishing" is actually a poor translation of the French word "galetage". Applicants stated that a good translation of this term is "deep rolling". Applicants also presented a document demonstrating that "machine a galeter" translates to "roller finishing and deep rolling machines". (Emphasis added.)

Additionally, Applicants enclose herewith a verified English translation of the priority document which corresponds to the present application. In this application, the term "galetage", as found in the priority document, has been correctly translated to "deep rolling".

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the case In re Oda, which indicates that correcting a translation error does not constitute new matter. See In re Oda, 170 U.S.P.Q 268 (CCPA 1971). Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the correction of the term "burnishing" to "deep rolling" does not constitute new matter.

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the remarks filed July 3, 2006 together with the following remarks.

Initially, the Examiner is respectfully requested to review the remarks set forth in the Amendment filed July 3, 2006.

Furthermore, in the Advisory Action dated July 19, 2006, the Examiner stated that there is no limitation requiring mechanical reinforcing operation to impart high compressive mechanical residual stresses, and therefore this was not a patentable consideration.

However, as discussed above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to require that the deep rolling is performed with an applied load between 800 daN and 1200 daN, thus generating high residual compressive stresses.

Therefore, in view of the amendments and remarks filed July 3, 2006, as well as the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the ground of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Herve MICHAUD et al.

By: _____

Amy E. Schmid
Registration No. 55,965
Attorney for Applicants

AES/tnt
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 3, 2007